

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7, 8, and 13 being the independent claims. Claims 16-19 are sought to be added.

Objections to the Drawings

In the Action on page 2, section 2, the drawings are objected to as including a reference number in FIG. 5 (number 37) not mentioned in the description. Applicant respectfully traverses the objection. Billing unit 37 in FIG. 5 also appears in FIG. 3 and FIG. 4, and is mentioned, for example, on p. 11, line 18 in connection with FIG. 3, and on page 12, line 22 in connection with FIG. 4. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Action on pages 3-9, claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,591,249 to Zoka (hereinafter "Zoka"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites, in the relevant portion, a first enterprise system, a second enterprise system including *a second database server apparatus for receiving the authentication data from the second authentication apparatus, requesting corresponding template data from the first database server apparatus, receiving the corresponding template data from the first database server apparatus, comparing the authentication data with the corresponding template data, thereby authenticating the user, and storing and managing the template data* if the user is authenticated successfully.

Zoka fails to teach at least three elements of claim 1. First, Zoka fails to teach a second enterprise system including **a second database server apparatus for receiving the authentication data from the second authentication apparatus, and requesting corresponding template data from the first database server apparatus**. Instead, Zoka discloses in Figures 2 and 3 a single biometric credit card system having a fingerprint scanner (16) in communication with the TouchScan system (30) through the user's Internet system (20). If, for the sake of argument, e-

commerce site (24) or credit card provider (32) is aligned with the second enterprise system recited in claim 1, **neither of these systems (24) or (32) include a database server apparatus that requests or receives template data from the TouchScan system.** Instead, e-commerce site (24) forwards the user's biometric information to the TouchScan system, and receives from the TouchScan system **only information about whether identity is verified,** and whether the transaction is approved or rejected. See Zoka col. 9, ll. 11-19. The TouchScan system does not transmit, and e-commerce site (24) does not receive, template data. Further, credit card provider (32) interacts with the TouchScan system only to confirm credit worthiness and available credit. See Zoka, col. 8, ll. 47, 58-60.

Second, Zoka fails to teach a second database server apparatus for **comparing the authentication data with the corresponding template data, thereby authenticating the user.** Instead, the purported second enterprise system in Zoka does not include a database server that compares authentication data with template data or that authenticates the user. **Only the TouchScan system** performs comparisons between authentication data and template data, and only the TouchScan System can authenticate a user from biometric information. Authentication data may be **forwarded** from a second system to the TouchScan system, but there is no disclosure in Zoka of any second system performing comparisons or authentications with the biometric data.

Third, Zoka fails to teach a second database server apparatus for **storing and managing the template data.** Instead, Zoka teaches storage and management of template data **only on the TouchScan system.** None of the purported second enterprise systems in Zoka stores or manages template data.

Zoka therefore fails to teach a second database server in a second enterprise system for receiving the authentication data from the second authentication apparatus, requesting corresponding template data from the first database server apparatus, receiving the corresponding template data from the first database server apparatus, comparing the authentication data with the corresponding template data, thereby authenticating the user, and storing and managing the template data if the user is authenticated successfully. Consequently, claim 1 is allowable, and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 7, 8 and 13 recite similar limitations to those in claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above regarding claim 1. Claims 9, 11, 12, 14, and 15 are allowable as being dependent from allowable claims. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Action on pages 3-9, claims 3, 4, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zoka. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 3, 4, and 6 depend from claim 1, and claim 10 depends from claim 8. Claims 1 and 8 are allowable over Zoka as discussed above. Claims 3, 4, 6, and 10 are allowable as being dependent from allowable claims. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn and these claims be allowed.

Dependent claims 16-19 are added, and are allowable as being dependent from allowable claims.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated:

March 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.

Registration No.: 41,289

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney/Agent For Applicant